



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,894	10/08/2004	Kenneth Lee Perdue	PU020113	2481
24498	7590	02/20/2008		
Joseph J. Laks Thomson Licensing LLC 2 Independence Way, Patent Operations PO Box 5312 PRINCETON, NJ 08543			EXAMINER FLORES, LEON	
			ART UNIT 2611	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/20/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/510,894	Applicant(s) PERDUE, KENNETH LEE	
	Examiner Leon Flores	Art Unit 2611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-7 and 10-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9,19 and 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims (1 & 15) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Response to Remarks

Applicant asserts that, *"Sgambati does not properly correspond to the "control circuit" of claim 1, as amended herein, In particular, controller 10 of Sgambati does not prevent one circuit from re-transmitting the signals it receives from another circuit back to that other circuit, as claimed (see column 5, line 51 to column 7, line 20)"*.

The examiner respectfully agrees. However, a new ground of rejection has been issued.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims (1 & 15) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maddocks et al. (hereinafter Maddocks) (US Patent 6,483,616 B1) in view of Sgambati. (US Patent 5,606,443)

Re claim 1, Maddocks discloses a circuit arrangement comprising: a first circuit having an output line and an input line (See fig. 1: 3); a second circuit having an input line for receiving signals from the output line of the first circuit, and an output line for transmitting signals to the input line of the first circuit. (See fig. 1: 4)

But Maddocks fails to explicitly teach a control circuit having input lines for receiving the signals from the output lines of the first and second circuits, the control circuit inhibiting the signals transmitted from the output line of the second circuit to the input line of the first circuit when the first circuit is transmitting signals to the input line of the second circuit and thereby preventing the second circuit from re-transmitting the signals received from the first circuit back to the first circuit.

However, in fig.1 & col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 12, the reference of Maddocks does suggest the teachings of a control circuit (9, 10, 16, 17, 21, 22, as a whole) having input lines for receiving the signals from the output lines of the first and second circuits (31, 33), the control circuit inhibiting the signals transmitted from the output line of the second circuit to the input line of the first circuit when the first circuit is transmitting signals to the input line of the second circuit and thereby preventing the second circuit from re-transmitting the signals received from the first circuit back to the first circuit. (See col. 2, line 57 – col. 3, line 12, "shuts down")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to incorporate these features into the system of Maddocks, in the manner as claimed, for the benefit of optimizing the communication system.

The reference of Maddocks discloses the limitations as claimed above, except they fail to explicitly teach that it further prevents the first circuit from generating an interrupt signal.

However, Sgambati does. (See fig. 1: 10 & col. 5, lines 5, lines 9-11 & col. 6, lines 15-35) Sgambati discloses a controller for controlling the communication between two circuits. When operating in a demonstration mode, the controller inhibits the signals received via an IR receiver, thereby preventing the remote control from generating an interrupt signal.

Taking the combined teachings of Maddocks and Sgambati as a whole. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skills in the art to incorporate this feature into the system of Maddocks, in the manner as claimed and as taught by Sgambati, for the benefit of preventing interrupts.

Claim 15 is a method claim corresponding to system claim 1. Hence, the elements in system claim 1 would have necessitated the steps performed in method claim 15. Therefore, claim 15 has been analyzed and rejected w/r to claim 1 above.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims (2, 4-14, 16-20) objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon Flores whose telephone number is 571-270-1201. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7-5pm Alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Payne can be reached on 571-272-3024. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LF
February 4, 2008


DAVID C. PAYNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER